

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-22 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 9, and 16 are independent claims. Claims 1, 9, 16-20 and 22 have been amended, claims 6 and 14 have been canceled, and no claims have been added.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-20, prior to this amendment, are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 9, 16-20 and 22 were amended, and claims 6 and 14 were canceled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this Application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-22 as presented prior to this Amendment, and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicants' representative and the Examiner on July 8, 2008. During the telephonic interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed one of the 103 references (Sameer, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,158,778). In particular, Applicants' representative discussed that Applicants' wireless client periodically wakens from sleep mode in order to check whether a wake on LAN (WOL) command resides at an access point for the wireless client to process. In contrast, Sameer teaches away from awakening from sleep mode to ping a wireless access point. Applicants' representative suggested amending Applicants' independent claims to further describe this novelty. The Examiner suggested that such amendment may read over the art of record but wished to review the submitted amendment along with the prior art in more detail.

Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acceptance of Applicants' formal drawings filed concurrently with the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 16-22 in this response and request removal of the 101 rejection to these claims in the next Office communication.

Claim Rejections – Alleged Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sameer, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,158,778, hereinafter “Sameer”) in view of Connery, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,276, hereinafter “Connery”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Claims 6 and 14 have been canceled in this response and, therefore, rejections to these claims are moot.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to further describe Applicants’ wireless client awaking from sleep mode in order to query Applicants’ wireless access point. Support for such amendment may be found in Applicants’ specification on page 18, line 9 through page 19, line 5. Therefore, no new matter is added with such amendment. As amended, independent claim 1 is directed to a method of handling a client request in a wireless computer network with limitations comprising:

- entering into a sleep mode at a wireless client;
- while in the sleep mode at the wireless client, detecting a timeslot that corresponds to the wireless client;
- in response to detecting the timeslot, awakening from sleep mode and sending a query from the wireless client to a wireless access point;
- receiving the query at the wireless access point from the wireless client;
- identifying whether a wake on LAN request corresponds to the wireless client in response to receiving the query; and
- sending the wake on LAN request to the wireless client in response to the identification.

Applicants’ wireless client periodically awakens from sleep mode in order to check whether a wake on LAN (WOL) command resides at an access point for the wireless client to process. In contrast, Sameer teaches away from awakening from sleep mode to ping a wireless access point. Sameer states:

“In contrast to the standard specified by the IEEE 802.11, **the device 11 is not required to wake up periodically to receive beacon signals** from the AP 19. Rather, the device 11 only sends a signal to the AP 19 before it goes off-line, and sends another signal to the AP 19 after the device becomes accessible again. This allows the device 11 to save a significant amount of power compared to a device implementing the IEEE 802.11 standard.” (col. 2, lines 60-67, emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above excerpt, Sameer teaches away from periodically awakening from sleep mode in order to send a query to a wireless access point. Rather, Sameer teaches sending a signal before it goes off-line and sends another signal after the device becomes accessible again. The Office Action suggests that Sameer teaches awakening from sleep mode in order to send a query but, after further review, Sameer does not teach such limitations. Sameer states:

“If the device 11 leaves the wireless network 110 **due to a sudden loss of connection** to the AP 19, the device 11 may not be able to notify the AP19 prior to losing the connection...After the **device 11 returns to the wireless network 110**, the device 11 sends an “I am back” message to the AP 19 to indicate the accessibility.” (col. 2, lines 21-49, emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above excerpt, Sameer discloses that when a sudden loss of connection (out of range, etc.) occurs, the wireless device sends a message to the wireless access point once the wireless device returns to the network. This is different, however, than awakening from sleep mode for the purpose of sending the query, let alone waiting to awaken until a timeslot occurs. As a result, Sameer never teaches or suggests “*entering into a sleep mode at a wireless client; **while in the sleep mode at the wireless client, detecting a timeslot that corresponds to the wireless client; in response to detecting the timeslot, awakening from sleep mode and sending a query from the wireless client to a wireless access point***” as claimed by Applicants. The Office Action does not suggest that Connery teaches such limitations and, indeed, Connery does not teach such limitations. Therefore, since neither Sameer nor Connery teach or suggest, either alone or in combination with each other, all the

limitations included in Applicants' claim 1 as amended, amended claim 1 is allowable over Sameer in view of Connery.

Claim 9 is an information handling system claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable over Sameer in view of Connery for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable as discussed above. Claim 16 is a computer program product claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable over Sameer in view of Connery for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable as discussed above.

Each of claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-13, 15, and 17-22 each depend, either directly or indirectly, upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 9, or 16. Therefore, each of claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-13, 15, and 17-22 are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742